

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/090,093	03/04/2002	Neall W. Humphrey	15849.118	4307	
27683 75	590 06/27/2003				
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP			EXAMINER		
901 MAIN STR DALLAS, TX	REET, SUITE 3100 75202		NEILS, PI	EGGY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2875		
			DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003	DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		11					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
•	10/090,093	HUMPHREY ET A	L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Peggy A. Neils	2875					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif NO period for reply sepecified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturent Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	136(a). In no event, however by within the statutory minimu will apply and will expire SIX te. cause the application to be	may a reply be timely filed on of thirty (30) days will be considered timely (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this concome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/4	<u> 1/02</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-fina	l.	٠				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 18	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application	on.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from considerati	on.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s)	_						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5) 🔲 1	nterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No Notice of Informal Patent Application (PT Other:					
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office							

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In Claim 2, "second ring" needs to be changed to --ring assembly--. In Claim 7, "lower" should be deleted unless Applicant wants to positively set forth an orientation/location for the ring assembly.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-8, 10-16, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu 6,523,981.

Wu shows a lamp shade assembly which includes an upper ring 1, a ring assembly 21 and 22, a shade cover 4 and a support 3 comprising shafts 31 and a cross-member 32. Shafts 31 are formed with a slight curve and cross-member 32 approximates the same radius as the upper ring. The lower end of the shaft does not have a cross-member but instead has a fastening section 33. The

Application/Control Number: 10/090,093 Page 3

Art Unit: 2875

top portion of the shaft 32 is disclosed as being propped between the top ring 1 and bottom ring

2. As shown in Figure 3, the frame assembly is collapsible. The lower ring assembly comprises
two rings 21 and 22 secured together to form a groove 221 which receives the fastening section
33 of the support shaft. As shown in Figure 2A, the inner ring 21 is not located in the same plane
22 as the outer ring. The frame also includes means 12/121 for attaching the lamp shade assembly
to a lamp. In the absence of any unobvious or unexpected results whether the support 3 has one
or two shafts and one or two cross-members is a matter of design choice. The completed
assembly accomplishes the same desired result of a collapsible lamp shade assembly as the claimed
invention.

- 5. Claims 9 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu 6,523,981 as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Stadler.

 Stadler teaches that it is known in the art to have a support shaft for a lamp shade assembly which is straight. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the shafts of Wu could be formed with a straight orientation in the same manner as taught by Stadler because both references are directed to lamp shade assemblies.
- 6. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu 6,540,383.

Wu shows a lamp shade assembly which includes a support 3 comprising a pair of curved members 32 propped between a upper ring 1 and a lower ring 2. The curved portions 32 of the

Application/Control Number: 10/090,093 Page 4

Art Unit: 2875

support approximate the same radius as the upper and lower rings. To rotate the support into position is matter of design choice.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu 6,540,383 as

applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Stadler.

Stadler teaches that it is known in the art to have a straight support shaft for a lamp shade assembly. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that Wu could be modified to have a straight support shaft in the same manner as taught by Stadler because both references are directed to a lamp shade assembly.

Conclusion

8. Any questions regarding this Office action should be directed to Examiner Neils at (703) 308-6554.

Y. MY QUACH-LEE PRIMARY EXAMINER